

Remarks/Arguments:

Claim 57 stands rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,776,135 (Errico) and separately anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,474,551 (Finn).


Claim 57 recites a "camming mechanism". The Office Action defines "camming mechanism" as something capable of converting a rotating motion into a reciprocating (back-and-forth) motion. Based on this definition, the Office Action concludes that a camming mechanism is shown in both Errico and Finn. This is clearly incorrect.

Errico and Finn do not show "camming mechanisms" as defined in the Office Action. They simply show screws. The screws in Errico and Finn have single direction threads. Therefore, rotating screw (158) in Errico moves the screw in one direction only. Similarly, rotating screw (80) in Finn moves the screw in one direction only. Accordingly, rotation of the screws in Errico and Finn does not *convert rotating motion into a reciprocating motion*. The threads simply convert rotating motion to linear motion in one direction.

The Office Action may be suggesting that screw (158) and screw (80) are capable of reciprocating motion because the screws can move in two possible directions. That is not "reciprocating" or back and forth motion. Moreover, it is not attributed to any camming mechanism. Changes in screw direction are caused by the user, and the direction they decide to rotate the screw. It is not caused by a mechanism.

Based on the foregoing, the rejection of claim 57 cannot be sustained.
Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered, and the allowance of claim 57 be reinstated.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher A. Rothe, Reg. No. 54,650
Attorney for Applicants

CAR/ks

Dated: September 18, 2009

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. **18-0350** for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.